

### **REMARKS**

This is in response to the Office Action mailed 07/28/2006. In the Office Action, claims 1-49 were cited as being subject to restriction requirements. Reexamination and reconsideration of this case is respectfully requested in view of the amendments made herein and the following remarks.

No claim has been added or canceled by this response. Accordingly, claims 1-49 remain at issue in the patent application. Of those at issue, claims 1, 12, 23, and 33 are independent claims. Applicant believes that no new matter has been added by this response.

#### **I) First Restriction Requirement**

On page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-49 were made subject to a first restriction requirement under 35 USC 121 based on search classification. Claims 1-49 were restricted to the following two groups of claims:

I) Claims 1-22 and 33-47, drawn to an integrated circuit, classified in class 324, subclass 763.

II) Claims 23-32 and 48-49, drawn to a method, classified in class 324, subclass 765.

In response, Applicant elects to go forward with claims 1-22 and 33-47, drawn to an integrated circuit, classified in class 324, subclass 763 without traverse as it has the largest number of claims paid for.

## II) Second Restriction Requirement

On page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-49 were further made subject to a second restriction requirement under 35 USC 121 based on species. Claims 1-49 were restricted to three species.

The Office Action states “This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species:

- (a) The species detailed in Applicant's specification at page 5, lines 6-17;
- (b) The species detailed in Applicant's specification at page 5, line 18 to page 6, line 5;
- (c) The species detailed in Applicant's specification at page 6, lines 17-32.”

In response, Applicant provisionally elects to go forward with species (a) and respectfully traverses the second restriction requirement for the following reasons.

The embodiments described on Applicant's specification from page 5, line 6 through page 6, line 32 were based on Applicant's claims as filed. Applicant has since amended the claims such that these embodiments described in the specification may not accurately represent what is currently claimed.

The Office Action did not restrict the species to respective figures as is ordinarily the case. Accordingly, it is difficult to determine what claims read on the species. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1-49 read on Species (a).

The Office Action states “Currently, no claim appears to be generic.” Applicant respectfully disagrees. Applicant respectfully submits that at least independent claims 1, 12, 23, and 33 are generic.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully request reconsideration of this restriction requirement.

